

Royal College of Physicians

OUR RELATIONS WITH HOMŒOPATHY.

LIBRARY
D.L. REG
ED. EDV

LETTER

TO THE

PROVINCIAL MEDICAL AND SURGICAL JOURNAL.

(REPRINTED FROM THAT PERIODICAL).

WITH AN

APPENDIX CONTAINING IMPORTANT DOCUMENTS.

BY

JOHN ROSE CORMACK, M.D., F.R.S.E.,

FELLOW OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS OF EDINBURGH;
AND FORMERLY PHYSICIAN TO THE ROYAL INFIRMARY
AND FEVER HOSPITALS OF EDINBURGH.

LONDON :

TAYLOR, WALTON, AND MABERLY.

UPPER GOWER STREET, AND IVY LANE, PATERNOSTER ROW.

M.DCCC.LI.

Price Sixpence.

LONDON:
RICHARDS, 37, GT. QUEEN STREET

CONTENTS.

I. DR. CORMACK'S LETTER, WITH POSTSCRIPT, CONTAINING CORRESPONDENCE	5
II. RESOLUTIONS OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS OF EDINBURGH	15
III. RESOLUTIONS OF THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS OF EDINBURGH	16
IV. THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH, AND HOMŒOPATHIC CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF MEDICINE	<i>ib.</i>
V. THE UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREW'S, AND HOMŒOPATHIC CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF MEDICINE	18



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016

<https://archive.org/details/b28043170>

Letter to the Editor of the Provincial Medical and Surgical Journal.

Putney, July 29, 1851.

SIR,—While, with you, I recognize the greatness of the benefit conferred on legitimate medicine by the recent acts of the Scottish Colleges,* I cannot help feeling that we ought to do more than, as individuals, yield to them our concurrence and applause. We ought not, I think, to allow our annual meeting at Brighton to pass without issuing a deliverance upon the subject of homœopathy, as explicit as those which have come to us from beyond the Tweed; and there is one point upon which it appears to me that even more plainness of expression is required.

To adopt resolutions setting forth that the homœopathic dogma, and the doctrine of infinitesimal doses, have no truthful basis, and are, in fact, mere nonsensical delusions, may be quite proper, inasmuch as some honest but weak and undisciplined minds have been seduced by the hardy assertions and false reasoning by which these errors have been supported. But something more is required, if it be true, as I think it is, that this fashionable quackery is so susceptible of

* Vide Appendix.

adaptation to the most contradictory prejudices of shallow men and women, as to have become a sort of Protean deceit, able to lure lucre by every imaginable wile from the sick and the silly. The worst part of homœopathy is, in my opinion, the DISHONESTY of the majority of those who live by it. When patients are once secured, they are, I think, very rarely treated in accordance with the principles of Hahnemann; but are retained by the combination of every current medical novelty which may at the time be most in favour with the moneyed throng of quack-fanciers. I have not been able to hear of any practitioner who honestly relies on homœopathy for the cure of disease; but I can point to many calling themselves homœopathic practitioners, who attempt to relieve the symptoms of disease by the same means which we would adopt; and to others, who retain their *clientelle* fully as much by practising hydropathy, mesmerism, and miscellaneous tricks, as by giving the globules. If homœopathy were honestly practised, it might be amicably dealt with; but as it is truly a combination of any and every available charlatanic trick, it cannot be effectively opposed as a distinct medical heresy, and therefore all that remains for us, as men of science and men of integrity, is to give notice, that we exclude from all professional intercourse practitioners who are in any way engaged in using or upholding a system which we think bears upon its very face fraud as well as absurdity.

I have heard it urged in extenuation of the fall of some medical men, that they had large starving fami-

lies, and that they had met with distressing pecuniary reverses. It has often been said to me, that if they treated disease to the best of their ability, there was no great crime in their sailing so far with the fashionable current as to call themselves homœopathic, and to give globules as placebos. From my heart I compassionate these persons; for I know that want has distorted and destroyed the moral sense even in good men; but, while in some cases we pardon the transgressors, let us not be tolerant of the transgression. It behoves us, quickly and decidedly, to draw a broad line between medicine and homœopathy, so as to encourage and strengthen the hands of many in our impoverished and overstocked profession, who, though tempted, have not yet bartered principle for pelf.

The Provincial Medical and Surgical Association has now the power, and the near opportunity, of drawing this much-needed line of demarcation:—*Let the Association declare that the names of homœopathic practitioners, and of those who hold professional intercourse with them, cannot be on its list of members.* The promulgation of this law would enlighten the public. It would also deter some too-facile consulting physicians from meeting the homœopathic quacks “simply for diagnosis”; and it would make it impossible for operating surgeons to say that they did not mean to insult the profession, “that they only went to give a surgical opinion” or “perform an operation”. When it is known that such unworthy proceedings are of daily occurrence in London; and when we see Fellows of our metropolitan colleges eagerly seeking as

the patrons of their hospitals Lord Carlisle, Lord Robert Grosvenor, and other noblemen, who are notorious abettors of homœopathic charities, is it wonderful that the public mind has become poisoned, and unable to discriminate between legitimate medicine and fraudulent practice ?* When we see Fellows of both London Colleges so demeaning themselves, and remaining uncensured, how can the Colleges serve the cause of truth ? In these circumstances, it is doubly the duty of our great Association to come forward ; and when we meet at Brighton, let us make the fact of membership a more distinctive test of professional morality than any now existing out of Scotland.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

JOHN ROSE CORMACK.

POSTSCRIPT.

As the following recent correspondence illustrates some of the points to which I have adverted, perhaps you may think it worth adding as an appendix to my letter.

* It is sometimes said, that as quacks find their best friends among the nobility and clergy of England ; and that as we now have as patrons of homœopathy, mesmerism, etc., the Earl of Carlisle, the Duke of Beaufort, the Marquis of Anglesea, Archbishop Whately, the Chevalier Bunsen, etc. (just as, some years ago, peers, peeresses, and priests, were the most zealous apostles of St. John Long, of “Morison, the Hygeist”), the best way to neutralize this influence is to divide it, getting the same persons to patronise medicine and medical charities. The argument and the principle are both bad, and the fruits of the miserable policy which they support are too apparent. The public are unable to discriminate between physicians and quacks.

No. I.—A. B., Esq., to Dr. Cormack.

July 12, 1851.

MY DEAR SIR,—As you are aware that I have been for some time much impressed in favour of homœopathic medicines, I hope you will not think me actuated by any want of confidence in your professional skill and careful treatment, if I wish to place my baby under a different system of medicine. I can assure you it was the high opinion we have entertained of your professional knowledge that led us, in spite of our loss of faith in the ordinary medicines, to ask you to attend the baby; but we find ourselves unable longer to resist the desire to adopt homœopathic medicines, especially as we feel that *that* is the only change we could make in our leaving ——, which we shall do at the end of this month. We feel ourselves very much indebted to you for your particularly kind attention to, and treatment of, Mrs. A. B., which will always cause us to remember you with great regard. Although we are putting the baby under what you may consider a proscribed system, we can assure you that Mrs. A. B. will at all times have the same pleasure in seeing you. I have written what I conscientiously feel, and I hope you will always consider me as yours, very sincerely and obliged,

A. B.

P.S. Mrs. A. B. begs me to add, that if you are at —— to-day, she will be glad to explain our feelings towards you, more fully than I have in this note.

No. II.—A. B., Esq., to Dr. Cormack.

On same day.

MY DEAR SIR,—It has just occurred to me that, as I did not say otherwise in my note of this morning, you may, perhaps, conclude that we considered the baby's state, and your treatment of her, unsatisfactory. This is not so, as she is no doubt, under the circumstances, as well as we could expect; but I have from the beginning of her attack feared any complication of the head or lungs, and felt that in such an event I could hardly change the treatment, although I should have had very great apprehension as to the efficacy of the remedies at your command. I wrote and left home hurriedly this morning, so I do not know if Mrs. A. B. will mention this, should she see you. Again believe me to be yours sincerely,

A. B.

No. III.—Dr. Cormack's answer to A. B.

On same day.

MY DEAR SIR,—Having yesterday stated to Mrs. A. B. that I expected baby to go *safely* (though to me and to her very *anxiously*) through her illness, and as I thought that I had on good grounds and successfully relieved Mrs. A. B. from the idea of any present danger, I was not prepared for your first letter, which I got before I left home in the morning. Your second I have just received. Entertaining the opinions which you hold regarding the sources which I have at command, as compared with others which you can obtain,

you have properly performed your duty as a parent ; and I receive your letters in the same kindly spirit in which they were written and intended.

You are right in stating that I regard homœopathy as a “ proscribed system ” ; but I would not have you to believe that my principal objection to it is its non-acceptance by scientific men, after a thirty years’ discussion. The homœopathic dogma has, as far as I can see, no adequate basis to rest upon ; and the doctrine of infinitesimal doses is immeasurably beyond the grasp of my intellect. For these reasons, I cannot assent to them. But it is upon far higher grounds that I consider homœopathic practitioners, as a body, justly proscribed ; and at last divorced publicly by the College of which I have the honour to be a Fellow.

Homœopathists stand convicted by their practice of being disbelievers in the doctrines on which they found their claims to be regarded as superior to the Colleges ; and so ill disguised of late has been the want of accordance between their principles and their practice, that homœopathy has become in England nothing more than a conventional appellation for a very clever quack system—one of the many which from time to time arise, and fasten themselves parasitically to the science of medicine, filling the pockets and cankering the integrity of not a few of its nominal cultivators. A good many patients have come to me from homœopathic doctors ; and I have thus discovered that even the commonest and the coarsest of the “ ordinary ” means of cure are habitually used by them. Castor oil and aloes are advised in the ordinary

purgative doses ; camphor is given in very large doses in the same circumstances in which I would administer it ; croton oil is used as a counter-irritant ; cod-liver oil is relied on in some forms of phthisis ; and in several cases of disease I have actually found that, with the globules, hydropathy and mesmerism were had recourse to ! There is nothing here stated but what I can prove to be true.

But let me remind you of the circumstances of Mrs. A. B.'s case when you first called me in to take charge of her, on the 17th of May, last year. She had been under a gentleman described by you to me as a homœopathic obstetric physician, whose name, however, I do not now remember. I found that, in addition to the globules (containing, as was to be supposed, the billioneth or trillioneth of a grain of some medicinal agent), she was taking regularly, under the direction of her homœopathic (?) adviser, boluses of a purgative paste, which from its taste I perceived to be principally composed of Barbadoes aloes ; and she was also using as a lotion a strong solution of alum. I then stated, that, granting the infinitesimal doses had any power, it was impossible to assign to them their share in any effects produced, if other and powerful remedies were used along with them, such as the aloes and the alum ; and that it seemed very odd to regard the latter as mere "adjuvants", the other medicines, from some unexplained cause, being regarded as the truly potent and beneficial. I looked upon the globules as non-essential and charlatanic, and I therefore discarded them, but

as I regarded the aloes and alum as required, I continued them; adding, however, which seemed not less needed, ammonia, valerian, and henbane. I believe that very great good resulted from the system which was adopted both before and after Mrs. A. B.'s confinement; and from her having got through that trial so much better than on former occasions, I think there need be no question on this point. The use of iron by the eldest child also seemed to be attended with decided benefit; and I have always felt that although there was nothing but what was very "ordinary" in the practice adopted, it was signally successful. From these circumstances — from the complete and cordial way in which all my directions were carried out, from the very agreeable intercourse which we have had, and in particular from the very kind exertions which you used in my behalf in the matter of —, I can very sincerely reciprocate all the kind expressions contained in your letters. As you are not of my profession, we may very easily agree to differ on the subject of homœopathy; but that this difference may ever be thoroughly amicable, the best plan is, after this mutual explanation, to let the matter drop. *You* cannot convince *me* that homœopathy is true in theory, or that the "system", so called, is honest in practice, or that it legitimately brings riches to starving doctors. On the other hand, *I* could not satisfy *you* that the facts of "the proscribed system" bear a less proportion to its astounding theories than Sir John Falstaff's halfpenny worth of bread to a gallon of sack.

We have both written what we conscientiously feel,
and I hope you will always consider me as

Yours, very sincerely and obliged,

JOHN ROSE CORMACK.

No. IV.—Mrs. A. B. to Dr. Cormack. Some days later.

MY DEAR SIR,—It struck me for the first time this morning, that you have possibly thought we had decided on, or at least contemplated, changing our baby's treatment, before I saw you on Friday (4th July). I write to you immediately to assure you that this was not the case. We have often from time to time given the children a globule, and on Friday evening, when Mr. A. B. came home, he was very anxious to give baby something, to see if it would relieve her cough ; it appeared to us to do her so much good, that we resolved on Saturday to let her see Dr. —, and to try homœopathy properly with her. I feel sure that you will excuse my troubling you with this explanation, as it would really grieve me if you thought I could speak to you as I did on Friday, at the same time intending to act as we did on Saturday. You will, I think, like to hear that dear baby's cough has nearly left her, though she continues very weak, and has a bad appetite. I hope you will come to see us before we leave —. I shall always feel grateful to you for your kindness to me and to the children.

Believe me, my dear Sir,

Yours very sincerely,

MATILDA A. B.

APPENDIX.

“THE recent Acts of the Scottish Colleges” alluded to, are the Resolutions of the Royal Colleges of Edinburgh, and of the Universities of Edinburgh and St. Andrew’s. They are here subjoined.

I.

RESOLUTIONS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS OF EDINBURGH REGARDING PRACTITIONERS OF HOMŒOPATHY.

“At Edinburgh, and within the College Hall there, the 9th day of May 1851, an Extraordinary Meeting of the Royal College was held, pursuant to a Resolution agreed at the last Quarterly Meeting, and of which Extraordinary Meeting due notice was given.

“THE PRESIDENT in the Chair. The following Resolutions were moved, seconded, and unanimously agreed to :—

“I. That the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh did, several years ago, publicly express its opinion of Homœopathy and Homœopathic Practitioners, by peremptorily declining to admit into its body a Candidate for its Fellowship who belonged to that denomination ; and, consequently, that no Fellow of the College can possibly be ignorant of the light in which all those who practise Homœopathy are regarded by the College.

“II. The College regrets that, notwithstanding this decided expression of its opinion, more than one of its Fellows, after being admitted in a different character, have endangered the reputation of the College by becoming Homœopathic Practitioners ; and the College expresses an earnest hope that these Fellows, seeing they have thus virtually separated themselves from the College, will spontaneously sever their further connexion with an Institution which repudiates them, and from which they can derive, as merely nominal Fellows, nothing else than a false position and a spurious credit.

“III. The College feels the more bound thus to express its opinion, seeing that those Fellows who have become Homœopathists, and any other Medical Practitioners who follow Homœopathy, must necessarily be aliens to the other Fellows, and to the profession at large ; inasmuch as no Fellow of this College, or any other Physician can, by any possibility, without derogating from his own honour, and from the honour of the profession, meet Practitioners of Homœopathy in consultation, or co-operate with them in the other common duties of professional life.

“IV. That although the College has not thought it expedient hitherto to take any active steps for disclaiming those fellows who have become Homœopathic Practitioners subsequently to their admission to the College, nevertheless, since it has the power of dealing summarily with those who act in a manner so unbecoming the character of a Physician, it reserves its right to exercise that power when it shall be so advised.

“Signed in Name, and by Authority, of the College,
“J. Y. SIMPSON, *President*.”

II.

RESOLUTIONS UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS OF EDINBURGH, REGARDING PRACTITIONERS OF HOMŒOPATHY.

At a meeting of this College, held on the 16th of May, the following Resolutions were moved by the PRESIDENT, and unanimously carried.

"I. The College having considered a series of Resolutions transmitted by the Royal College of Physicians [of Edinburgh] in regard to Homœopathy, feel called upon to express their opinion, that the system so designated being entirely inconsistent with the principles professed by candidates for the diploma of the College of Surgeons, any Fellow or Licentiate who practises it, or countenances others in doing so, by meeting them in consultation, will justly incur the disapprobation of the College.

"II. That a copy of the above Resolution be transmitted to the Royal College of Physicians.

"Signed in Name, and by Authority, of the College,

"JAMES SYME, *President*."

III.

THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH AND HOMŒOPATHIC CANDIDATES FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR MEDICINÆ.

The following statement from the Medical Faculty of the University of Edinburgh appeared in the *Edinburgh Monthly Journal* for August 1851; and it is here, in justice to all parties, reprinted without curtailment.

"Sundry printed letters and pamphlets in the homœopathic interest have been extensively circulated of late in this city and elsewhere, relative to proceedings in the Royal College of Physicians, and in the University, against the delusions of homœopathy. Our readers would scarcely thank us, were we to make these productions the subject of criticism. But, as several of them make use of an incorrect account, which has been given in a homœopathic periodical, of a recent decision of the Medical Faculty, in the case of a candidate for medical honours and homœopathic distinction, we feel compelled to supply the professional public with a true version of the whole matter. If we thus violate, for the first time, the well-understood compact between examiners and candidates in this University,—that the fact and circumstances of failure shall be confined to themselves,—the individual principally concerned has himself alone to blame. He must take the consequences of his own ill-advised publication, and his perverted report of the proceedings.

"MR. ALFRED CROSBY POPE, having appeared before the Second Division of Examiners of the Medical Faculty in the middle of June, underwent the usual written examination on the practical branches of medicine and surgery, and was afterwards subjected to an oral examination on the same subjects. He had satisfied several of the examiners; but his surgical knowledge was evidently defective. While under examination in midwifery, he was asked what doses of calomel, opium, tartar-emetic, and aloin he would give in certain diseases; in reply, he stated correctly the doses usually given in medical practice; when asked, whether these were the doses which he would himself prescribe, he replied that they were. He then underwent an examination on materia medica, the professors of that branch, and of clinical surgery, being present. His replies were satisfactory enough; the only objection of any moment indeed being, that his doses of medicine were somewhat large. The Faculty having been furnished with positive information that Mr. Pope had avowed his

purpose to become a homœopathic practitioner after graduating, it was determined that he should have an opportunity of answering to the charge. The question was put to him by Dr. Christison, and the following are the very words of the conversation that ensued: 'Well, Mr. Pope, I am satisfied so far with your answers; but there is another point on which I wish to be informed; and as it is best not to beat about the bush, I shall put to you a plain question, in order that I may get a downright answer. I am told by a colleague, that he has been informed on good authority, that it is your intention to become a homœopathic practitioner after you graduate; *after the answers you have this day given me*, I feel bound to say I do not believe it. Am I right?' To which Mr. Pope replied, 'I am not now a homœopathist; but, after graduation, I mean to inquire into the truth of it.' Professor Syme then remarked, 'Now, Mr. Pope, suppose that this inquiry which you meditate were to confirm your belief in the truth of homœopathy, what would you do with the diploma received from us? would you burn or return it?' 'No', he replied, 'I would keep it.' 'For what purpose?' 'To show that I had regularly studied.' 'Studied what? Delusions! Fallacies! Nonsense! It would only show that you had misspent four or five years of your life in studying what could not possibly be of any service, according to your own view; and I am sure that on reflection you must see, how inconsistent it would be with common honesty, or common sense, to use a diploma, after ceasing to entertain the principles which were professed in order to obtain it. But recollect, Mr. Pope, I offer this remark to you as a friend, and not as a professor.' Mr. Pope then withdrew, and in what remained of his examinations he made a satisfactory appearance, except in medical jurisprudence, in which, as in surgery, he was defective.

"The case being a new one, it was referred by the examiners to the whole Medical Faculty for decision. Of the thirteen members, eleven were present. After considering the whole circumstances, the Faculty unanimously resolved—'That serious doubts are entertained as to the soundness of Mr. Pope's principles of practice; and that on this account, as well as his insufficiency on some subjects of examination, he shall be remitted till the end of July, by which time he will have had ample opportunity of making the inquiry into the truth of homœopathy, which he says he contemplates.' This resolution, which admitted of his graduating this year, in the event of his satisfying the Medical Faculty, was communicated to him in conversation by the dean. Mr. Pope, however, withdrew at once from the list of candidates.

"This is a correct narrative of the whole official proceedings. Anything else that may have been said to the candidate privately by individual professors, could have been said in kindness only, and by them as individuals alone, and is wholly irrelevant.

"We must add a single word for the information of distant friends of the University, who may be led to surmise that the misfortune of this young man in some measure justifies the fears expressed in some quarters, lest students may be infected with the delusions of homœopathy while studying at Edinburgh. The Medical Faculty had distinct evidence, which will be produced, if necessary, that when Mr. Pope came to study here three years ago, he avowed that he had practised homœopathy, and came to study for a degree, in order to settle as a homœopathic practitioner. This determination was repeated afterwards; and it could neither have been engendered nor strengthened by any instructions received within the walls of the University, for the principles and practice of homœopathy have never been taught there by any professor." (pp. 196-198.)

IV.

THE UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREW'S AND HOMŒOPATHIC CANDIDATES
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR MEDICINÆ.

MR. ROBERT DOUGLAS HALE, by means which the law does not allow to be characterised in print, recently obtained the degree of Doctor of Medicine from the University of St. Andrew's. In consequence of residence not being exacted (as at Edinburgh), it was not known to the University that the candidate was a homœopathic practitioner. Upon a rumour of this having reached St. Andrew's, after the error had been committed, Dr. Day, the Professor of Medicine, wrote a letter to Mr. Hale; and the published correspondence fully justifies the University from the charge which had been brought against it, of having knowingly granted a degree to an unworthy man.

DR. DAY TO THE EDITOR OF THE LANCET.

SIR,—As I am led to infer by your leading article in this morning's *Lancet* that you charge the University of St. Andrew's with having conferred the degree of doctor of medicine on a homœopathic practitioner, I must beg you to publish the accompanying extracts from the answers given by the gentleman in question, as well as a copy of the note which I have addressed to him on the subject of your editorial remarks. I am, Sir, your obedient servant, GEORGE E. DAY, M.D., Professor of Medicine. University of St. Andrew's, June 7, 1851.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF EXAMINATION.

1. Name the emetics included in the Pharmacopœia, and state the doses in which they should be prescribed.

Answer. Ipecacuanha, tartar-emetic, sulphate of zinc, and sulphate of copper. The doses are, of ipecacuanha, one scruple; of tartar-emetic, from one grain to two grains, acting better if in combination with ipecacuanha; of sulphate of zinc, from five grains to ten grains; and of sulphate of copper, from two to four or five grains.

2. Name the cases in which croton oil, aloes, jalap, gamboge, scammony, and elaterium, are specially applicable, and the form and dose in which you usually prescribe them.

Answer. Croton oil is administered in cases of very obstinate constipation, where other milder purgatives fail. It is used externally as a powerful means of counter-irritation.

Aloes is a useful purgative where there is inertia of, or accumulation of feculent matter in, the sigmoid flexure of the colon, or in the rectum, and in cases of atonic dyspepsia, chlorosis, etc.

Jalap is a useful purgative in a variety of diseases, and is useful in cases of worms, etc., in children.

Gamboge and scammony are allied purgatives, the former being rather more drastic than the latter.

The dose of croton oil is usually from the one-eighth to the one-fourth of a drop, according to the strength of the patient, and the urgency of the symptoms. It is seldom given uncombined, and generally in the form of pills.

Aloes are given in pills, in doses of from five to ten grains—generally given in combination with scammony, calomel, or blue-pill. The decoction of aloes is a useful form, the dose being from half an ounce to an ounce and a half.

Gamboge and scammony, mostly in pills. Dose, from three to five grains of the former, and about the same of the latter.

Elaterium is a powerful hydragogue cathartic, useful in various forms

of dropsy, in carrying off a large amount of serum from the intestinal mucous membrane. Dose, from one-sixth to one-fourth of a grain.

3. Write a Latin prescription for an expectorant mixture suitable for a case of chronic bronchitis ; also for a warm aperient draught.

Answer.

℞ Misturæ ammoniaci, uncias quinque.

Tincturæ scillæ, drachmas duas.

———— opii compositæ, drachmas duas.

Misce. Fiat mistura. Capiat cochleare unum amplum bis vel ter in die.

℞ Decoeti aloes compositi, drachmas sex.

Tincturæ rhœi compositæ, drachmam.

Misturæ camphoræ, drachmas quatuor.

Fiat haustus quamprimum sumendus.

4. Describe the treatment of iritis.

Answer. Mercury is the chief remedial agent, preceded by general or local abstraction of blood, if the strength of the patient will bear it. It should be given in small, frequently-repeated doses—half a grain or a grain of calomel. In small doses, first, because the system is more brought under the action of mercury when the doses are small and frequently repeated ; and second, because opium being contra-indicated, owing to its effect in producing contraction of the pupil, it ought to be given in doses that will not irritate the intestinal mucous membrane, producing diarrhœa, by which it would be carried out of the system, and not absorbed into it. In the strumous diathesis, the mercury should be given with caution ; the doses should be smaller ; and the bichloride often acts better than the chloride, in such cases. In the gouty and rheumatic diathesis, colchicum may be combined with the mercurial ; and iodide of potassium is advantageous in some forms of the disease. Besides the local treatment by leeching, the external application of belladonna and the exclusion of light are most important means to prevent the closure and adhesion of the free margin of the iris. Counter-irritation may be demanded, in addition to other treatment.

5. Describe the treatment of acute laryngitis.

Answer. The treatment consists in active antiphlogosis, bleeding, leeching, etc. ; the exhibition of mercury (calomel, two grains, every two, three, or four hours ; but this may be preceded, in most cases, by nauseating doses of tartar-emetic (one-sixth to one-fourth of a grain), every two, three, or four hours. Leeches should not be applied over the larynx, owing to the difficulty of using pressure to stop the bleeding. Cupping in the nape of the neck is often better than leeches.

6. Describe the treatment of enteritis.

Answer. Antiphlogistic treatment here must not be so rigorous as in many other inflammatory affections, as there is a tendency to prostration. Local abstraction of blood, fomentations and poultices ; the exhibition of mucilaginous drinks with the cautious exhibition of calomel or hydrargyrum c. creta, in combination with opium or Dover's powder, include the principles of treatment. In this disease, the exhibition of opium alone, with other means tending to diaphoresis, will often be sufficient ; and, under this treatment, the action of the bowels will become restored without the use of purgatives, which, in this disease, are questionable in any of the ordinary forms.

7. Mention the treatment of the various forms of intestinal entozoa.

Answer. For the tape-worm ; the best remedy for ejecting it is the oil of turpentine, given in doses of from three drachms to five drachms. with castor-oil. The lumbrici are expelled by many purgatives, which have

the effect of producing mucous stools, as calomel and jalap, scammony, &c. Ascarides may be got rid of by using, in addition to the above, enemata of infusion of quassia. In all cases of worms, the tone of the digestive apparatus should be improved by tonics and alteratives.

Although the above extracts from Dr. Hale's written answers "specifying the mode of treatment he is in the habit of adopting, and the doses of the medicines which he prescribes" [see the note to our third Examination Paper], are, I think sufficient to demonstrate that he cannot be a homœopath, I may add the additional evidence afforded by some portions of his oral examination in *materia medica*. Dr. Anderson was his examiner, but I was present, and noted down the questions and answers.

Dr. Hale stated that the doses of bichloride of mercury, when given as an alterative, varied from one-twelfth to one-sixteenth of a grain; that in croup (in the case of a child of three years of age), he would give one-sixth to one-fourth of a grain of tartar-emetic every four hours; and that in the pneumonia of adults he would give half a grain of the same medicine every three or four hours; that in prescribing hyoscyamus as a sedative, he gave eight or ten grains of the extract; and, finally, that he used arsenious acid in certain forms of skin disease (the squamous forms), and in diseases of a periodic type, his dose being one-sixteenth of a grain, or from five to ten or fifteen minims of Fowler's solution.

GEORGE E. DAY.

DR. DAY TO DR. HALE.

DEAR SIR,—There is an article in *The Lancet* of this week asserting that you have been, and still are, practising homœopathy. As no homœopathist, without utterly denying his creed, and being guilty of the grossest deception, could have replied as you did to the practical questions, I entertain a sanguine hope that you will meet this charge with a prompt and distinct denial. In order at once to check a report equally injurious to yourself, and to the University from which you have received your degree, I forward by this post to *The Lancet* certain extracts from your answers to the practical questions, and a copy of the note I have now the honour of addressing you.

I am, dear Sir, faithfully yours,
 Dr. Robert Douglas Hale. GEORGE E. DAY.

DR. HALE TO DR. DAY.

St. Giles's-street, Norwich, June 12, 1851.

DEAR SIR,—It would have been more courteous to have waited for a reply from me before sending your communication to *The Lancet*. I shall therefore simply state, that it was not my business to declare myself a homœopathist, and that I think your expression of "grossest deception" is wholly inapplicable either to me or to any one who, under such circumstances, practises such reserve as I did. The obvious aim I had in view in replying to the questions put at my examination, was to prove that my knowledge of medicine was such as to entitle me to the certificate of competency to practise in the usual mode followed, and that it was not from ignorance of the old system that I had conscientiously adopted the new.

I cannot imagine that you, or any right-minded man who considers the present state of medicine, and of medical parties in these realms, would, after due consideration, apply the term you have used, to a reserve so necessary as that I practised, in not putting forward my therapeutical views.

For the censure or praise of a bigoted and prejudiced periodical I care

but little, but I do regret that my conduct should for a moment appear in a light it ill deserves, in the eyes of the enlightened Professor of Medicine in the University from which I have had the honour of receiving my degree.

I remain, dear Sir, very faithfully yours,

ROBERT DOUGLAS HALE.

To George Day, Esq., M.D.

DR. DAY'S ANSWER.

St. Andrew's, June 14, 1851.

DEAR SIR,—I regret that your answer to my note is of so unsatisfactory a nature. While I beg to assure you that I have no wish to apply the term “grossest deception” to your conduct in a personally offensive view, I must still express my opinion that no honest homœopath, conscious that the examiners trusted to his honour “to specify the mode of treatment he is in the habit of adopting, and the doses of the medicines which he prescribes”, could have obtained his degree at our last examination.

I am, dear Sir, faithfully yours,

To Dr. Robert Douglas Hale.

GEORGE E. DAY.

It is evident, that not only has Dr. Day successfully vindicated the orthodoxy of his University, but has made it impossible for the future for homœopathic practitioners to obtain a medical degree from that institution, except by prevarication and falsehood.

